TABLE B
SUMMARY AND COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Illustration by Lawrence Ormsby

Peregrine falcon (Falco peregrinus anatum)

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
WATER RESOURCES		
		• Overall, regional, long–term, moderate, beneficial impacts would occur largely due to removing facilities from the RPO and the 100–year floodplain, and removal of the Cascades Diversion Dam.
	• In Yosemite Valley, adverse impacts would continue, largely due to the presence of existing facilities and development. Natural hydrologic processes of the Merced River have been interrupted, as facilities interfere with river meandering and flooding, causing unnatural erosion and deposition, and impeding flood flows. Facilities and development also adversely impact water quality, primarily through non–point source pollution associated with runoff from paved surfaces, developed areas, and recreational use of the Merced River.	• In Yosemite Valley, beneficial impacts would result largely due to removal of existing facilities that interfere with hydrologic processes (including flooding) and reduction of non–point source pollution. • Removal of Sugar Pine Bridge would allow for river process restoration in this area, including natural flood flows and river meandering. • Removing facilities from the RPO and restoring these areas would increase riverbank stability and allow for introduction of large woody debris into the river channel. • Removal of Cascades Diversion Dam would restore the natural hydrologic processes of the Merced River in this area. • Water quality would be improved through the reduction in vehicles miles, treatment of stormwater runoff at the new transit facility at Camp 6, and removal of facilities from the RPO. Radiating impacts resulting from concentrations of visitors (e.g. Yosemite Village) and recreational use of the river would continue to adversely impact water resources.
	• In El Portal, adverse impacts would continue, largely due to the presence of existing facilities and development. Natural hydrologic processes of the Merced River have been interrupted by facilities and the riprap that protects these facilities. Facilities and development also adversely impact water quality, primarily through non–point source pollution associated with runoff from paved surfaces, developed areas, and recreational use of the Merced River.	• In El Portal, adverse impacts would result, largely due to the construction of new facilities. Construction of a substantial housing complex at Hennessey's Ranch and improvement of the flood levee would adversely affect floodplain values, as would construction of two pedestrian bridges across the Merced River and development at Railroad Flat. • A beneficial impact to water quality would result from implementation of the RPO. Adverse impacts would result from increased non–point source pollution from increased development.

Acronyms:

CO	carbon monoxide
HABS/HAER	Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record
HVR	highly valued resource(s)
NO_x	nitrogen oxide
NPS	National Park Service
ORV	Outstandingly Remarkable Values
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PM	particulate matter
RPO	River Protection Overlay
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
VOC	volatile organic compound
WSR	Wild and Scenic River
YCS	Yosemite Concession Services Corp.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
WATER RESOURCES		
• Overall, long–term, moderate, beneficial impacts to water re–sources would result, largely due to the removal of facilities in Yosemite Valley from the RPO and the 100–year floodplain and the removal of the Cascades Diversion Dam.	• Overall, long–term, moderate, beneficial impacts to water re–sources would result, largely due to the removal of facilities in Yosemite Valley from the RPO and the 100–year floodplain and the removal of the Cascades Diversion Dam.	• Overall, long–term, moderate, beneficial impacts to water re–sources would result, largely due to the removal of facilities in Yosemite Valley from the RPO and the 100–year floodplain and the removal of the Cascades Diversion Dam.
• In Yosemite Valley, beneficial impacts to water resources would result, largely due to the removal of existing facilities that interfere with hydrologic processes (including flooding) and reduction of non–point source pollution.	• In Yosemite Valley, beneficial impacts to water resources would result, largely due to the removal of existing facilities that interfere with hydrologic processes (including flooding) and reduction of non–point source pollution.	• In Yosemite Valley, beneficial impacts to water resources would result, largely due to the removal of existing facilities that interfere with hydrologic processes (including flooding) and reduction of non–point source pollution.
• Removal of Sugar Pine, Stoneman, Superintendent's, and House–keeping Bridges, and possible reconstruction of Swinging Bridge, would allow for the restoration of natural river processes in these areas, including natural flood flows and meandering of the river.	• Removal of Sugar Pine, Stoneman, Superintendent's, and House–keeping Bridges, and the possible reconstruction of Swinging Bridge, would allow for the restoration of natural river processes in these areas, including natural flood flows and meandering of the river.	• Removal of Sugar Pine and Ahwahnee Bridges, and the possible reconstruction of Swinging Bridge, would allow for the restoration of natural river processes in these areas, including natural flood flows and meandering of the river.
• Removal of facilities from the RPO, and restoration of these areas, would increase stability of the riverbanks and allow for intro–duction of large woody debris into the river channel.	• Removal of facilities from the RPO, and restoration of these areas, would increase stability of the riverbanks and allow for intro–duction of large woody debris into the river channel.	• Removal of facilities from the RPO, and restoration of these areas, would increase stability of the riverbanks and allow for intro–duction of large woody debris into the river channel.
• Removal of Cascades Diversion Dam would restore the natural hydrologic processes of the Merced River in this area.	• Removal of Cascades Diversion Dam would restore the natural hydrologic processes of the Merced River in this area.	• Removal of Cascades Diversion Dam would restore the natural hydrologic processes of the Merced River in this area.
• Restoration of Camp 6 would restore natural hydrologic processes in the area, particularly flooding, thus causing a long–term, major, beneficial impact. Radiating impacts resulting from concentra–tions of visitors (e.g., at Yosemite Village) and recreational use of the river would continue to adversely impact water resources.	• Restoration of Camp 6 would restore natural hydrologic processes in the area, particularly flooding, thus causing a long–term, major, beneficial impact. Radiating impacts resulting from concentra–tions of visitors (e.g., at Yosemite Village) and recreational use of the river would continue to adversely impact water resources.	• Adverse impacts associated with the development of Camp 6 would continue, although that portion of Camp 6 in the RPO would be restored to natural conditions. Radiating impacts resulting from concentrations of visitors (e.g., at Yosemite Village) and recreational use of the river would continue to adversely impact water resources.
• Water quality would be improved through the reduction of vehicle miles traveled, the treatment of stormwater runoff at the new Visitor/Transit Center at Taft Toe, and removal of facilities from the RPO.	• Water quality would be improved through the reduction of vehicle miles traveled, the treatment of stormwater runoff at the new Visitor/Transit Center at Taft Toe, and removal of facilities from the RPO.	• Water quality would be improved through the reduction of vehicle miles traveled, the treatment of stormwater runoff at the new transit facility at Camp 6 and Curry Village, and removal of facilities from the RPO.
• Impacts to water resources in El Portal would be the same as described for Alternative 2.	• Impacts to water resources in El Portal would be the same as described for Alternative 2.	• Impacts to water resources in El Portal would be the same as described for Alternative 2.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
FLOODPLAINS		
	• Impact would be long–term and adverse.	• The overall impact would be long–term, moderate, and beneficial.
	• In Yosemite Valley, 66 employee beds, 248 lodging units, and miscellaneous structures would remain within the 100–year floodplain, resulting in a long–term, adverse impact to property and human safety from flood hazard. Facilities that would remain in the floodplain include Housekeeping Camp lodging units, the kennel, concessioner stable and associated housing (49 employee beds), the Concessioner Headquarters, three structures at Ahwahnee Row (3 employee beds), the Superintendent's House (Residence 1), five Yosemite Lodge motel units, the Wellness Center and nearby custodial cabins, the Indian Creek apartments (14 employee beds), and Concessioner Headquarters, resulting in impacts that would be long–term and adverse.	• In Yosemite Valley, 164 Housekeeping Camp lodging units, the kennel, concessioner stable and associated housing (49 employee beds), the Superintendent's House (Residence 1), five Yosemite Lodge motel units, the Wellness Center and nearby custodial cabins, and the Indian Creek apartments (14 employee beds) would be removed from the floodplain, resulting in beneficial impacts to property and human safety.
	• In El Portal, 108 employee beds and various nonhousing facilities would remain in the 100–year floodplain. Nonhousing facilities that would remain within the floodplain include the Yosemite Institute office, bulk fuel facility, gas station, El Portal Market, ranger station and offices at the Village Center, and portions of the El Portal warehouse at Railroad Flat, resulting in a long–term, adverse impact to property and human safety from flood hazard.	• In El Portal, the bulk fuel facility would be removed from the floodplain resulting in moderate, beneficial impacts to property and human safety. Construction of 657 employee beds, necessary support facilities, and employee parking at Village Center would result in long–term, minor, and adverse impacts.
	• In Wawona, portions of the Pioneer Yosemite History Center would remain in the 100–year floodplain, resulting in long–term, adverse impacts to property and human safety.	• The impacts for facilities in Wawona would be the same as those for Alternative 1.
WETLANDS		
		• The overall impact would be long–term, major, and beneficial.
	• No measurable change from or impacts to the current conditions would occur on the size, integrity, or connectivity of wetlands.	• There would be a net gain of 118 acres of wetlands (HVRs) and the overall integrity and connectivity of existing wetlands in the area would be enhanced. Wetlands would be connected from the east end of Yosemite Valley to Bridalveil Meadow (with the exception of Camp 6), which would enhance natural processes between the main Merced River channel, riparian borders, and meadows, thus promoting healthy wetlands in the area. This would result in long–term, major, beneficial impacts.

Acronyms:

CO	carbon monoxide
HABS/HAER	Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record
HVR	highly valued resource(s)
NO_x	nitrogen oxide
NPS	National Park Service
ORV	Outstandingly Remarkable Values
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PM	particulate matter
RPO	River Protection Overlay
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
VOC	volatile organic compound
WSR	Wild and Scenic River
YCS	Yosemite Concession Services Corp.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
FLOODPLAINS		
• The overall impact would be long–term, moderate, and beneficial.	• The overall impact would be long–term, moderate, and beneficial.	• The overall impact would be long–term, moderate, and beneficial.
• In Yosemite Valley, removal from the floodplain of 212 Housekeeping Camp lodging units, the kennel, concessioners stables and associated housing (49 employee beds), three structures at Ahwahnee Row (3 employee beds), the Superintendent's House (Residence 1), five Yosemite Lodge motel units, the Wellness Center and nearby custodial cabins, and the Indian Creek apartments would cause long–term, moderate, beneficial impacts. The Concession Headquarters and Indian Creek apartments area would be redeveloped as parking/visitor services and new overnight parking at Yosemite Lodge would be developed, causing a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact because the flood–related risk to human safety and property would be reduced.	• The impacts to facilities in Yosemite Valley would be the same as those for Alternative 3.	• In Yosemite Valley, removal from the floodplain of 164 housekeeping lodge units, concessioners stables and associated housing (49 employee beds), three structures at Ahwahnee Row (3 employee beds), the Superintendent's House (Residence 1), five Yosemite Lodge motel units, the Wellness Center and nearby custodial cabins, and the Indian Creek apartments (14 employee beds) would cause long–term, moderate, beneficial impacts. The Concession Head–quarters, Indian Creek apartments, and concessioner stable areas would be redeveloped as parking/ visitor services/camping and new overnight parking at Yosemite Lodge would be developed, thus causing a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact because the flood–related risk to human safety and property would be reduced.
• Actions with long–term, moderate, beneficial impacts to property and human safety in El Portal would include removal from the floodplain of 36 employee beds and the bulk fuel facility.		• Actions with long–term, moderate, beneficial impacts to property and human safety in El Portal would include removing 36 employee beds and the bulk fuel facility from the floodplain.
• In El Portal, construction of 656 employee beds at Hennessey's Ranch and the new NPS headquarters and administrative buildings at the Railroad Flat would be reduced from long–term, moderate, adverse to long–term, minor and adverse through the mitigation of flood hazards.	• The impacts to facilities in El Portal would be the same as those for Alternative 3.	• In El Portal, construction of 656 employee beds at Hennessey's Ranch and the new NPS headquarters and administrative buildings at Railroad Flat would be reduced from long–term, moderate, adverse to long–term, minor, and adverse through the mitigation of flood hazards.
• The impacts for facilities in Wawona would be the same as those for Alternative 1.	• The impacts to facilities in Wawona would be the same as those for Alternative 1.	• The impacts for facilities in Wawona would be the same as those for Alternative 1.
WETLANDS		
• The overall impact would be long–term, major, and beneficial.	• The overall impact would be long–term, major, and beneficial.	• The overall impact would be long–term, minor to moderate, and beneficial.
• There would be a net gain of 139 acres of wetlands (HVRs), and the overall integrity and connectivity of existing wetlands in the area would be enhanced, causing a long–term, major, beneficial impact.	• There would be a net gain of 131 acres of wetlands (HVRs), and the overall integrity and connectivity of existing wetlands in the area would be enhanced, thus causing a long–term, major, beneficial impact.	• There would be a net gain of 104 acres of wetlands (HVRs), causing a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
WETLANDS (continued)		
	• Wetland vegetation would remain degraded in the campground areas of east Yosemite Valley. Facilities and infrastructure would remain, some of which directly impact former wetland areas, such as Upper and Lower River Campgrounds. • Surface water flows that sustain wetlands in meadows would remain obstructed by roads and other development.	• Long–term, minor, adverse impacts would occur to wetland integrity at out–of–Valley areas.
SOILS		
	• No measurable change from current soil conditions within the Valley and out–of–Valley areas. The existing condition would continue to gradually effect soils as a result of continued compaction and erosion.	• The overall impact would be long–term, moderate, and beneficial. • In Yosemite Valley, beneficial impacts would include a large amount of restoration of HVR soils (approximately 177 acres restored, of which 136 acres would be restored HVR soils), causing a long–term, major, beneficial impact. • In Yosemite Valley, adverse impacts would primarily be from new campground, housing, and lodging development (most of which would be non–HVR soils), causing a minor, adverse impact. • In out–of–Valley areas, long–term, locally moderate, adverse impacts (most of which would be in non–HVR soils) would occur primarily at Hazel Green/Foresta, Wawona, El Portal, and the entrance station visitor centers.
VEGETATION		
	• No measurable change from current conditions would occur in the Valley or at out–of–Valley areas. Existing conditions would continue to degrade gradually as a result of effects from continued concentrated and radiating human use. • Ecological functions would continue to be adversely effected by existing fragmentation.	• The overall impact would be long–term, moderate, and beneficial. • Large areas of HVR vegetation would be restored, causing a long–term, major, beneficial impact. The majority of the adverse impacts from new development would occur in non–HVR vegetation types and would be limited in the amount of new fragmentation. • In Yosemite Valley, adverse impacts would occur due to development of campgrounds, housing, and lodging (75 acres developed, 49 of which would be in non–HVR vegetation types).

Acronyms:

CO	carbon monoxide
HABS/HAER	Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record
HVR	highly valued resource(s)
NO_x	nitrogen oxide
NPS	National Park Service
ORV	Outstandingly Remarkable Values
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PM	particulate matter
RPO	River Protection Overlay
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
VOC	volatile organic compound
WSR	Wild and Scenic River
YCS	Yosemite Concession Services Corp.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
WETLANDS (continued)		
• Wetlands would be connected from the east end of Yosemite Valley to Bridalveil Meadow, which would enhance natural processes between the main Merced River channel, riparian borders, and meadows, thereby promoting healthy wetlands in the area. • Long–term, minor, adverse impacts would occur to wetland integrity at out–of–Valley areas. • Wetlands in the vicinity of Taft Toe would be indirectly impacted by increased visitor use, thus causing long–term, major, adverse impacts to wetland integrity.	• Wetlands would be connected from the east end of Yosemite Valley to Bridalveil Meadow, which would enhance natural processes between the main Merced River channel, riparian borders, and meadows, thereby promoting healthy wetlands in the area. • Long–term, minor, adverse impacts would occur to wetland integrity at out–of–Valley areas. • Wetlands in the vicinity of Taft Toe would be indirectly impacted by increased visitor use, causing long–term, major, adverse impacts to wetland integrity.	• Long–term, minor, adverse impacts would occur to wetland integrity at out–of–Valley areas.
SOILS		
• The overall impact would be long–term, moderate, and beneficial. • In Yosemite Valley, a large amount of restoration of HVR soils (206 acres restored, 144 acres of which would be restored HVR soils), causing a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact to soils. • In Yosemite Valley, most of the adverse impacts would be associated with the Taft Toe Visitor/Transit Center, which would be long–term and moderate; all parking facility impacts would be within the Valley (none of which would be in HVR soils). • In out–of–Valley areas, long–term, negligible, adverse impacts (most of which would be in non–HVR soils) would occur primarily in El Portal and at entrance station visitor centers.	• The overall impact would be long–term, moderate, and beneficial. • In Yosemite Valley, beneficial impacts would include a large amount of restoration of HVR soils (193 acres restored, 142 acres of which would be restored HVR soils), causing a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact to soils. • In Yosemite Valley, most of the adverse impacts would be associated with the Taft Toe Visitor/Transit Center, which would be long–term and moderate (none of which would be in HVR soils). • In out–of–Valley areas, long–term, moderate, adverse impacts (most of which would be in non–HVR soils) would occur primarily in El Portal, at entrance station visitor centers, and Hazel Green.	• The overall impact would be long–term, minor, and beneficial. • In Yosemite Valley, beneficial impacts would include a large amount of restoration of HVR soils (161 acres restored, 114 acres of which would be restored HVR soils). • In Yosemite Valley, long–term, minor, adverse impacts would occur from new campgrounds, housing, and lodging (most of which would be in non–HVR soils). • In out–of–Valley areas, most of the long–term, moderate, adverse impacts would occur in the El Portal, Foresta, and Henness Ridge areas for parking facilities as well as the entrance station visitor centers and housing at Wawona (most of which would be in non–HVR soils).
VEGETATION		
• The overall impact would be long–term, minor, and beneficial. • In Yosemite Valley, large areas of HVR vegetation would be restored, causing a long–term, major, beneficial impact. • The majority of the adverse impacts from new development would occur in non–HVR vegetation types and would be limited in the amount of new habitat fragmentation.	• The overall impact would be long–term, minor, and beneficial. • In Yosemite Valley, large areas of HVR vegetation would be restored, causing a long–term, major, beneficial impact. • The majority of the adverse impacts from new development would occur in non–HVR vegetation types and would be limited in the amount of new habitat fragmentation.	• The overall impact would be long–term, minor, and beneficial. • In Yosemite Valley, large but scattered areas of HVR vegetation would be restored, causing a long–term, major, beneficial impact. • The majority of adverse impacts would occur in non–HVR areas, and a limited amount of new habitat fragmentation would be generated.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
VEGETATION (continued)		
		• In Yosemite Valley, removal and/or consolidation of facilities out of the Merced River floodplain would provide increased ability to restore large portions of the Valley to natural conditions (175 acres restored, of which 160 would be in HVR vegetation types). Long–term, major, beneficial impacts would result from a reduction in fragmentation within the HVR vegetation types (meadow, riparian, and California black oak). • In Foresta, Big Oak Flat, Badger Pass, and South Entrance, increased human presence (trampling, non–native plants) and increased fragmentation of vegetation would slightly increase radiating impacts, resulting in long–term, negligible to major, adverse impacts. • At Wawona, Hazel Green, Foresta, and Tioga Pass, new housing, parking/transit facilities (vegetation loss), and increased human presence in the spring/summer (trampling) would result in long–term, moderate, adverse impacts. • In El Portal, new development within the administrative site and associated radiating impacts from increased human presence (trampling) would result in long–term, moderate, adverse impacts.

Acronyms:

CO	carbon monoxide
HABS/HAER	Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record
HVR	highly valued resource(s)
NO_x	nitrogen oxide
NPS	National Park Service
ORV	Outstandingly Remarkable Values
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PM	particulate matter
RPO	River Protection Overlay
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
VOC	volatile organic compound
WSR	Wild and Scenic River
YCS	Yosemite Concession Services Corp.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
VEGETATION (continued)		
• Long–term, major, beneficial impacts would occur to meadow and riparian vegetation communities in the east end of the Valley due to the removal of some facilities, consolidation of others out of the Merced River floodplain, and an increased ability to restore large portions of the Valley to natural conditions (205 acres restored, of which 186 would be in HVR vegetation types). • Restoration impacts would be somewhat offset by long–term, moderate, adverse impacts to upland forest communities due to the development of the Visitor/ Transit Center at Taft Toe. Additional long–term, moderate, adverse radiating impacts would occur to adjacent areas from increased human activity (trampling, non–native plants) in the currently undeveloped west end of the Valley. Approximately 99 acres would be developed in the Valley, 81 of which would be in non–HVR vegetation types. • In Foresta, Big Oak Flat, and South Entrance, long–term, minor, adverse impacts would occur as a result of slightly more radiating impacts from increased human presence (trampling, non–native plants) and increased vegetation community fragmentation. • At Tioga Pass Entrance, long–term, moderate, adverse effects would occur as a result of new parking/ transit facilities and increased human presence (trampling) in the spring/summer. • In El Portal, long–term, moderate, adverse effects would occur due to new development within the administrative site and from increased human presence (trampling).	• Long–term, major, beneficial impacts would occur to meadow and riparian vegetation communities in the east end of the Valley due to the removal of some facilities, consolidation of others out of the Merced River floodplain, and an increased ability to restore large portions of the Valley to natural conditions (193 acres restored, of which 174 would be in HVR vegetation types). • Restoration impacts would be somewhat offset by long–term, moderate, adverse impacts to upland forest communities in the Valley due to the development of the Visitor/Transit Center at Taft Toe. Additional long–term, moderate, adverse radiating impacts would occur to adjacent areas from increased human activity (trampling, non–native plants) in the currently undeveloped west end of the Valley. Approximately 102 acres would be developed in the Valley, 84 of which would be in non–HVR vegetation types. • In Foresta, Big Oak Flat, South Entrance, and Badger Pass, long–term, minor, adverse impacts would occur as a result of slightly more radiating impacts from increased human presence (trampling, non–native plants) and increased vegetation community fragmentation. • At South Landing, long–term, moderate, adverse impacts would occur (loss of stand structure and continuity) as a result of new parking/transit facilities and increased spring/summer human presence (trampling). • In El Portal, long–term, moderate, adverse effects would occur due to new development within the administrative site and from increased human presence (trampling).	• Long–term, major, beneficial impacts would occur to riparian communities in the east end of the Valley due to the removal of some facilities, consolidation of others out of the Merced River floodplain, and an increased ability to restore large portions of the Valley to natural conditions (162 acres restored, of which 146 would be in HVR vegetation types). • Long–term, minor to moderate, adverse impacts to upland communities in the Valley would occur due to development of campgrounds, housing, and lodging (69 acres developed, of which 48 would be in non–HVR vegetation types). • Long–term, negligible adverse impacts at Wawona, Foresta, Henness Ridge, and Tioga Pass Entrance would occur due to increased parking requirements and human presence (trampling) and increased vegetation community fragmentation. • There would be long–term, moderate, adverse impacts due to radiating impacts from an increased human presence in the spring/ summer (trampling) in the Wawona, Foresta, and Henness Ridge areas. These adverse effects would occur as a result of new housing and parking facilities (causing vegetation loss). • Long–term, moderate, adverse effects to vegetative communities in El Portal would occur due to new development within the administrative site and from increased human presence (trampling).

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
WILDLIFE		
	• Existing conditions would continue to degrade gradually as a result of continued concentrated and radiating human use. Habitat fragmentation would continue to be a prevalent impact on wildlife and their habitat in east Yosemite Valley, with large areas of HVR habitat occupied by camp–grounds, lodging units, and parking lots. Conditioning of wildlife to human foods would continue; however, no measurable change from existing conditions would occur.	• The overall impact would be long–term, major, and beneficial. • In the Valley, long–term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts would occur based largely on the increased size, continuity, and integrity of HVR habitat. Long–term, minor to moderate, adverse impacts would occur as a result of Camp 6 parking and widening of Southside Drive. • In the east Valley, El Portal, Hazel Green, Badger Pass, Wawona, and Foresta, long–term, minor to moderate, adverse impacts would result from habitat loss, increased human presence, and wildlife conditioning to human food. • Adverse impacts would result from development of new campgrounds near Tenaya Creek and east of Curry Village; however, impacts would primarily occur within non–HVR habitats. In addition, they would be offset by habitat improvements in the Valley and implementation of mitigation measures.
SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES		
Wildlife		
	• With existing conditions, there would be concentrated and radiating human use, habitat fragmentation, and the presence of non–native species. However, no measurable change to existing habitats would occur.	• The overall impact would be long–term, moderate, and beneficial because beneficial impacts to many California and federally listed species due to large increases in size, integrity, and connectivity of riparian, meadow, California black oak, and upland habitat areas within the Valley. • Potential long–term, adverse impacts on wildlife species of concern would be minor, based on the existing high levels of development in most impact locations. Implementation of site–specific mitigation measures and impacts would primarily consist of relatively small areas of upland habitat loss in comparison to the amount of upland habitat present in El Portal, Badger Pass, Hazel Green, Foresta, and other out–of–Valley areas.
Vegetation		
	• With existing conditions, there would be concentrated and radiating human use, habitat fragmentation, and the presence of non–native species. However, no measurable change to existing habitats would occur.	• The overall impacts on vegetation would be long–term, minor, and adverse. Fifty–one special–status plant species would be potentially impacted. With mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to long–term, negligible to minor, and adverse.

Acronyms:

CO	carbon monoxide
HABS/HAER	Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record
HVR	highly valued resource(s)
NO,	nitrogen oxide
NPS	National Park Service
ORV	Outstandingly Remarkable Values
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PM	particulate matter
RPO	River Protection Overlay
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
VOC	volatile organic compound
WSR	Wild and Scenic River
YCS	Yosemite Concession Services Corp.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
WILDLIFE		
• The overall impact would be long–term, moderate to major, and beneficial. • With Camp 6 fully restored, long–term, major, beneficial impacts would occur, based largely on the increased size, continuity, and integrity of HVR habitat within the Valley. • In the east and west Valley (Taft Toe), El Portal, Foresta, and Badger Pass, minor to major, adverse impacts would result from habitat loss, increased human presence, and wildlife conditioning to human food.	• The overall impact would be long–term, minor to moderate, and beneficial. • With Camp 6 fully restored, long–term, major, beneficial impacts would occur, based largely on the increased size, continuity, and integrity of HVR habitat within the Valley. • In the east and west Valley (Taft Toe), El Portal, Foresta and South Landing, minor to major, adverse impacts would result from habitat loss, increased human presence, and wildlife conditioning to human food.	• The overall impact would be long–term, minor, and beneficial. • Long–term, beneficial impacts would occur, based largely on the increased size, continuity, and integrity of HVR habitat within the Valley. However, Camp 6 would not be fully restored. • In the east Valley, El Portal, Foresta, Henness Ridge, and Wawona, long–term, minor to moderate, adverse impacts would result from habitat loss, increased human presence, and wildlife conditioning to human food.
SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES		
Wildlife		
• Impacts to special–status species would be essentially the same as Alternative 2, with overall long–term, moderate, beneficial impacts. • Long–term, negligible to minor, adverse impacts would primarily consist of relatively small areas of upland habitat loss in comparison to the amount of upland habitat remaining in Taft Toe, El Portal, and other out–of–Valley areas. The potential severity of adverse impacts on special–status wildlife species would be limited due to the existing high levels of development in most impact locations and the implementation of site–specific mitigation measures.	• Impacts to special–status species would be essentially the same as Alternative 2, with overall long–term, moderate, beneficial impacts. • Long–term, negligible to minor, adverse impacts would primarily consist of relatively small areas of upland habitat loss in comparison to the amount of upland habitat remaining in Taft Toe, El Portal, South Landing, Badger Pass, and other out–of–Valley areas. The potential severity of adverse impacts on special–status wildlife species would be limited due to the existing high levels of development in most impact locations and the implementation of site–specific mitigation measures.	• The overall impact would be long–term, minor, and beneficial because many state and federally listed species would experience scattered increases in riparian and meadow habitat within the Valley; however, this would be on a more limited basis than other action alternatives due to less area restored. • Long–term, negligible to minor, adverse impacts would primarily consist of relatively small areas of upland habitat loss in comparison to the amount of upland habitat remaining in El Portal, Henness Ridge, Foresta, and other out–of–Valley areas. The potential severity of adverse impacts on special–status wildlife species would be limited due to the existing high levels of development in most impact locations and the implementation of site–specific mitigation measures.
Vegetation		
• No impacts would occur to threatened or endangered plant species. Forty–three special–status plant species would be impacted. With mitigation, the overall impact would be long–term, negligible, and adverse.	• No impacts would occur to threatened or endangered plant species. Forty–seven special–status plant species would be impacted. With mitigation, the overall impact would be long–term, minor, and adverse.	• No impacts would occur to threatened or endangered plant species. Forty–seven special–status plant species would be impacted. With mitigation, the overall impact would be long–term, minor, and adverse.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES (continued)		
Vegetation (continued)		
		• Long–term, moderate, beneficial impacts would occur due to habitat restoration for park rare plant species such as boreal bedstraw, false pimpernel, and ladies' tresses in the Valley. • Long–term, minor to moderate, adverse impacts would occur due to habitat loss for rare plant species such as trillium in Wawona and slender–stemmed monkey flower and Small's southern clarkia at Hazel Green. Impacts to six species in El Portal would be mitigated by measures such as designs to avoid plant populations and habitat, and salvaging of topsoil for plant re–establishment.
AIR QUALITY		
	• Assuming vehicle traffic volumes remain similar to current levels, total air emissions would decrease over time because of fleet turnover to vehicles with advanced emission–control technologies. These advanced technologies would meet more stringent emission standards. The overall impact to local air quality would be long–term and beneficial.	• Long–term, moderate, adverse impacts on NO_x emissions would result from using diesel buses through 2015. Compared to air emissions for Alternative 1, there would be long–term, minor to major, beneficial impacts to VOC, CO, and PM emissions. • There would be long–term, moderate, beneficial impacts associated with using fuel cell buses. • Construction–related air emissions would be short–term, localized, and temporary in nature, and therefore would represent a short–term, minor, adverse impact to local air quality.
GEOLOGIC HAZARDS		
	• Overall, impacts are considered adverse because of the high concentration of essential, hazardous, and special occupancy facilities remaining in the talus slope zone; therefore, the level of risk to life and property would remain the same as it is currently.	• Overall, impacts would be long–term, moderate, and beneficial due to a reduction in the density of people and facilities in the talus slope zone. • The level of risk to life and property would be reduced by decreasing the density of standard occupancy structures from the shadow line and/or talus slope zones.

Acronyms:

CO	carbon monoxide
HABS/HAER	Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record
HVR	highly valued resource(s)
NO_x	nitrogen oxide
NPS	National Park Service
ORV	Outstandingly Remarkable Values
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PM	particulate matter
RPO	River Protection Overlay
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
VOC	volatile organic compound
WSR	Wild and Scenic River
YCS	Yosemite Concession Services Corp.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES (continued)		
Vegetation (continued)		
• Long–term, adverse impacts due to habitat loss for park rare plant species (such as six species in El Portal) would be mitigated by measures such as designs to avoid plant populations and habitat and salvaging of topsoil for re–establishment, thereby reducing the impact intensity to minor. • Beneficial impacts from habitat restoration would be the same as described in Alternative 2.	• Long–term, negligible to minor, adverse local impacts due to habitat loss for rare plant species (whitneya at South Landing and six species in El Portal) would be mitigated by measures such as designs to avoid plant populations and habitat and salvaging of topsoil for re–establishment. • Beneficial impacts from habitat restoration would be the same as described in Alternative 2.	• Adverse impacts due to habitat loss for park rare plant species (such as trilliums in Wawona and six species in El Portal) would be mitigated by measures such as designs to avoid plant populations and habitat, and salvaging of topsoil for re–establishment, resulting in a long–term, minor, adverse local impact. • Beneficial impacts from habitat restoration would be the same as described in Alternative 2.
AIR QUALITY		
• The impacts of this alternative would be the same as Alternative 2 from the present to 2015, except there would be beneficial impacts resulting from reduced NO_x emissions.	• The impacts of this alternative would be the same as Alternative 2 from the present to 2015, except there would be moderate, adverse impacts resulting from increased NO_x emissions.	• The impacts of this alternative would be the same as Alternative 2 from the present to 2015.
GEOLOGIC HAZARDS		
• The overall impact would be the same as described for Alternative 2 (long–term, moderate, and beneficial) due to decreasing the density of standard occupancy structures from the talus slope zone, primarily from the Curry Village and Housekeeping areas, and relocating essential facilities, one hazardous facility, and two special occupancy facilities out of the talus slope and shadow line zones. • The development of the Taft Toe Visitor/Transit Center within the shadow line zone would result in a long–term, adverse, and minor impact.	• The overall impact would be the same as described in Alternative 2. (long–term, moderate, and beneficial) due to decreasing the density of standard occupancy structures from the talus slope zone, primarily from the Curry Village and Housekeeping areas, and relocating essential facilities, one hazardous facility, and two special occupancy facilities out of the talus slope and shadow line zones. • The development of the Taft Toe Visitor/Transit Center within the shadow line zone would result in a long–term, adverse, and minor impact.	• Overall, impacts would be long–term, major, and adverse because there would be no change to the high concentration of essential, hazardous, and special occupancy facilities remaining within the talus slope and shadow line zone, and there would be an increase in the density of facilities within the shadow line zone.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
SCENIC RESOURCES		
	• Some existing scenic vistas into Yosemite Valley would continue to be obstructed by roads, traffic, and other development. Therefore, the amount of visual intrusion would remain the same as existing conditions. The degree of obstruction would continue to depend on the vantage point of the viewer.	• The overall impact would be long–term, major, and beneficial. • Approximately 140 acres of restoration would occur, primarily within the A Scenic category, causing a long–term, major, beneficial impact. There would be a net decrease in development by 71 acres within Yosemite Valley. • There would be 71 acres of new develop–ment, primarily adjacent to existing development in Yosemite Village, Yosemite Lodge, and Curry Village in the east Valley as well as the El Capitan crossover check station in the west Valley. • There would be minor, adverse visual impacts in out–of–Valley areas; however, these impacts would contribute directly to improving scenic resources within the Valley, where there is potential for greater beneficial gains.
CULTURAL RESOURCES		
Archeological Resources		
	• Construction of the Indian Cultural Center and routine maintenance activities would have the potential to adversely affect archeological resources; however, the National Park Service would strive to avoid or otherwise mitigate impacts, in accordance with the Programmatic Agreement.	• There would be varied impacts on as many as 58 archeological sites, depending on the potential of the archeological sites to yield significant information about prehistoric and historic lifeways and on the nature and design of proposed development. • In Yosemite Valley, there would be permanent, negligible to minor impacts as a result of data collection. • In El Portal, there would be permanent, moderate, adverse impacts related to development at Hillside East and West. • In all instances where identified sites could not be avoided, the National Park Service would undertake data recovery in accordance with the Programmatic Agreement to retrieve important information, thereby reducing the intensity of adverse impacts. In accordance with the Programmatic Agreement, the National Park Service would inventory project areas, test/evaluate the significance of identified sites, and carry out appropriate data recovery prior to construction disturbance.
Ethnographic Resources		
	• Establishing the Indian Cultural Center would result in beneficial impacts to ethnographic resources by strengthening American Indian presence in Yosemite Valley and strengthening traditional uses. Continued visitor use and routine maintenance have the potential to impact ethnographic resources, but the park	• Overall, actions in Yosemite Valley would have long–term, minor, adverse impacts to the Valleywide ethnographic resources. • Facilities removal and ecological restoration would benefit up to five traditional gathering areas by enhancing conditions for plant resources, and would remove modern development from three historic village areas.

Acronyms:

CO	carbon monoxide
HABS/HAER	Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record
HVR	highly valued resource(s)
NO$_x$	nitrogen oxide
NPS	National Park Service
ORV	Outstandingly Remarkable Values
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PM	particulate matter
RPO	River Protection Overlay
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
VOC	volatile organic compound
WSR	Wild and Scenic River
YCS	Yosemite Concession Services Corp.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
SCENIC RESOUR		
• The overall impact would be long–term, moderate, and beneficial. • The approximately 170 acres of restoration, primarily within the A Scenic category, and a net decrease in development by 72 acres within Yosemite Valley would result in a long–term, major, beneficial impact. • There would be 99 acres of new development, with some adjacent to existing development, but the primary impact would be at Taft Toe, where the impact would be long–term, major, and adverse in the Scenic A category. • The out–of–Valley impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2.	• The overall impact would be long–term, moderate, and beneficial. • Approximately 165 acres of restoration, primarily within the A Scenic category, and a net decrease in development by 66 acres within Yosemite Valley would result in a long–term, major beneficial impact. • There would be 99 acres of new development, with some adjacent to existing development, but the primary impact would be at Taft Toe, where the impact would be long–term, major, and adverse in the Scenic A category. • The out–of–Valley impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2.	• The overall impact would be long–term, minor, and beneficial. • Approximately 130 acres of restoration, primarily within the A Scenic category, and a net decrease in development by 63 acres within Yosemite Valley, would result in a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact. • There would be 68 acres of new development, primarily adjacent to existing development at Camp 6 and Curry Village, causing a long–term, moderate impact. • The out–of–Valley impacts would be the same as described in Alternative 2.
CULTURAL RESOURCES		
Archeological Resources		
• There would be varied impacts on as many as 59 archeological sites, depending on the potential of the archeological sites to yield significant information about prehistoric and historic lifeways and on the nature and design of proposed development. • Data recovery would be conducted as described for Alternative 2.	• There would be varied impacts on as many as 58 archeological sites, depending on the potential of the archeological sites to yield significant information about prehistoric and historic lifeways and on the nature and design of proposed development. • Data recovery would be conducted as described for Alternative 2.	• There would be varied impacts on as many as 59 archeological sites, depending on the potential of the archeological sites to yield significant information regarding prehistoric and historic lifeways and on the nature and design of proposed development. • Data recovery would be conducted as described for Alternative 2.
Ethnographic Resources		
• Overall, adverse impacts to the ethnographic resources would be the same as described in Alternative 2.	• Overall, adverse impacts to the ethnographic resources would be the same as described in Alternative 2.	• Overall, adverse impacts to the ethnographic resources would be the same as described in Alternative 2.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
CULTURAL RESOURCES (continued)		
Ethnographic Resources (continued)		
	would strive to avoid or mitigate impacts in accordance with the Programmatic Agreement.	• In Yosemite Valley, parts of up to eleven traditional gathering areas would be disturbed or destroyed by adding or expanding modern development at eight historic village areas, and by adding development in at least one area figuring in myth and legend. • In El Portal, proposed actions would most likely have moderate to major adverse impacts by destroying portions of historic villages and traditional gathering areas, and by adding concentrated residential use in some areas that are currently undeveloped. These actions would result in permanent, moderate to major, adverse impacts. • An ethnographic resources inventory and evaluation of impact areas would be conducted by the National Park Service. Also, the National Park Service would continue consulting with culturally associated American Indian people to seek ways to avoid, minimize, and mitigate potential adverse impacts to ethnographic resources. These measures could include setting aside some areas for traditional uses, designing new development to avoid the most sensitive areas, screening development from traditional use areas, and directing visitor and residential use away from sensitive areas.
Cultural Landscape Resources (Including Individually Significant Historic Sites and Structures)		
	• There would be no change or impact to the overall character of the landscape. Landscape characteristics, such as circulation patterns, patterns of land use, response to natural features, spatial organization, and architectural styles, would remain intact.	• The impact to the Valleywide cultural landscape with mitigation would be reduced from major to minor.
	• Historic properties and contributing cultural landscape features would be managed and protected under current policies. In some cases (as with Superintendent's House [Residence 1] and the historic orchards), benign neglect would be the management approach. The park would continue to avoid adverse impacts where feasible, or would otherwise carry out appropriate mitigation to reduce the intensity of impacts in accordance with the Programmatic Agreement.	• Minor to major, adverse impacts would result from removal, relocation, or modification of historic buildings and structures, or from introduction of modern facilities and development either within historic districts and contributing portions of the cultural landscape. Carrying out standard mitigation measures (e.g., HABS/HAER documentation) under the Programmatic Agreement would reduce the intensity of adverse impacts.
	• Adverse impacts to individual features, such as the eventual loss of Superintendent's House (Residence 1) and Lamon, Curry, and Hutchings Orchards, as well as the continued intrusion of noncontributing temporary housing structures, would result in a permanent, adverse impact to the overall character of the 10–square–mile Yosemite Valley Cultural Landscape Historic District, a property considered eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Adverse impacts to individual features would be mitigated according to	• Long–term, beneficial impacts would result from measures intended to restore native vegetation communities in patterns more in keeping with the cultural landscape and historic setting. Removal of noncontributing facilities and development from historic areas would also have permanent, minor, beneficial impacts. Adaptively using historic buildings would cause long–term, negligible, beneficial impacts by preserving buildings in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

Acronyms:

CO	carbon monoxide
HABS/HAER	Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record
HVR	highly valued resource(s)
NO_x	nitrogen oxide
NPS	National Park Service
ORV	Outstandingly Remarkable Values
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PM	particulate matter
RPO	River Protection Overlay
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
VOC	volatile organic compound
WSR	Wild and Scenic River
YCS	Yosemite Concession Services Corp.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
CULTURAL RESOURCES (continued)		
Ethnographic Resources (continued)		
Cultural Landscape Resources (Including Individually Significant Historic Sites and Structures)		
• The impact to the overall character of the Valleywide cultural landscape, with mitigation, would be reduced from major to moderate.	• The impact to the overall character of the Valleywide cultural landscape, with mitigation, would be reduced from major to moderate.	• The impact to the Valleywide cultural landscape, with mitigation, would be reduced from moderate to minor.
• There would be long–term, major, adverse impacts resulting from development of the Taft Toe Visitor/Transit Center.	• There would be long–term, major, adverse impacts resulting from development of the Visitor/Transit Center at Taft Toe.	
• Long–term, minor, beneficial impacts to the Valleywide cultural landscape would result from such actions as California black oak woodland and meadow restoration, removal of noncontributing structures, and ecological restoration of the riparian corridor along Yosemite Creek and the Merced River south of Yosemite Lodge. New development would be designed to be compatible with existing historic districts or settings	• Long–term, minor, beneficial impacts to the Valleywide cultural landscape would result from such actions as California black oak woodland and meadow restoration, removal of noncontributing structures, and ecological restoration of the riparian corridor along Yosemite Creek and the Merced River south of Yosemite Lodge. New development would be designed to be compatible with existing historic districts or settings	• Long–term, minor, beneficial impacts to the Valleywide cultural landscape would result from such actions as California black oak woodland and meadow restoration, the removal of noncontributing structures, and the ecological restoration of the riparian corridor along Yosemite Creek and the Merced River south of Yosemite Lodge. New development would be designed to be compatible with existing historic districts or settings

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
CULTURAL RESOURCES (continued)		
Cultural Landscape Resources (Including Individually Significant Historic Sites and Structures) (continued)		
	stipulations of the Programmatic Agreement, including documentation and salvage of materials.	• This alternative would result in long–term, major, adverse impacts to several individual features of the Valleywide landscape, including relocation of the Superintendent's House (Residence 1); loss of Sugar Pine and possibly Stoneman Bridges; loss of structures through the redesign of the NPS maintenance area and Curry Village; introduction of new parking facilities at Yosemite Village; and permanent changes in the land–use patterns, circulation, and spatial organization in the Valley.
Museum Collection (Including Archives and Research Library)		
	• The park's collection and archives are stored in inadequate facilities. Access to and availability of the materials to researchers and others would remain problematic.	• Housing the collection and archival materials in a central rehabilitated facility in Yosemite Valley would have moderate to major, beneficial impacts on the materials, and it would improve effectiveness in accessing, managing, and protecting these resources.
MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER		
Yosemite Valley (Segment 2)		
	• Adverse impacts to the Yosemite Valley segment ORVs would continue largely due to the presence of existing facilities that displace, degrade, or fragment riparian habitat; impede flood flow; inhibit natural meandering of the river; cause scouring or unnatural channeling of the river; or detract from the scenic interface of river, rock, meadow, and forest. In particular, historic bridges would continue to have a long–term, adverse impact on the hydrologic processes ORV because they prevent meandering and scouring, cause unnatural channeling, and impede flood flows.	• A long–term, moderate, beneficial impact on ORVs would result, largely due to removal of facilities that impede flood flows and inhibit the river's natural meandering; implementation of the RPO; restoration of substantial areas of river–related vegetation communities; improvement of the scenic interface of river, rock, meadow, and forest; and maintenance of the diversity of river–related recreational opportunities. A long–term, minor to moderate, adverse impact to the cultural ORV would occur due to the removal of historic structures and potential disturbance of river–related archeological resources.

Acronyms:

CO	carbon monoxide
HABS/HAER	Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record
HVR	highly valued resource(s)
NO_x	nitrogen oxide
NPS	National Park Service
ORV	Outstandingly Remarkable Values
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PM	particulate matter
RPO	River Protection Overlay
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
VOC	volatile organic compound
WSR	Wild and Scenic River
YCS	Yosemite Concession Services Corp.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
CULTURAL RESOURCES (continued)		
Cultural Landscape Resources (Including Individually Significant Historic Sites and Structures) (continued)		
to the greatest extent possible, and adverse impacts to individual features would be mitigated according to stipulations of the PA. • This alternative would result in long–term, major, adverse impacts to individual features, such as the loss of Superintendent's House (Residence 1) and Sugar Pine, Stoneman, Superintendent's, and Housekeeping Bridges, and permanent changes in land–use patterns, circulation, and spatial organization in the Valley.	to the greatest extent possible, and adverse impacts to individual features would be mitigated according to stipulations of the PA. • This alternative would result in, major, adverse impacts to individual features, such as the loss of Superintendent's House (Residence 1) and Sugar Pine, Stoneman, Superintendent's, and Housekeeping Bridges, and permanent changes in land–use patterns, circulation, and spatial organization in the Valley.	to the greatest extent possible, and adverse impacts to individual features would be mitigated according to stipulations of the PA. • This alternative would result in adverse impacts to individual features, such as the loss of Super–intendent's House (Residence 1), the loss of the Sugar Pine and Ahwahnee Bridges, and permanent changes in land–use patterns and circulation in the Valley.
• Data recovery would be conducted as described for Alternative 2.	• Data recovery would be conducted as described for Alternative 2.	• Data recovery would be conducted as described for Alternative 2.
Museum Collection (Including Archives and Research Library)		
• Impacts to the museum collection would be the same as described for Alternative 2.	• Impacts to the museum collection would be the same as described for Alternative 2.	• Impacts to the museum collection would be the same as described for Alternative 2, although the collection would be consolidated in El Portal.
MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER		
Yosemite Valley (Segment 2)		
• A long–term, moderate, beneficial impact on ORVs would result largely due to the removal of facilities that impede flood flows and inhibit the natural meandering of the river; implementation of the RPO; the restoration of substantial areas of river–related vegetation communities; the improvement of the scenic interface of river, rock, meadow, and forest; and the maintenance of the diversity of river–related recreational opportunities. • The beneficial impact of this alternative would be partially offset by the long–term, minor to moderate, adverse impact to the cultural ORV resulting from the removal of historic structures, as well as the radiating impacts to the ORVs resulting from concentrations of visitors (e.g., at Taft Toe).	• Impacts to ORVs would be the same as described for Alternative 3. A long–term, moderate, beneficial impact on ORVs would result largely due to the removal of facilities that impede flood flows and inhibit the natural meandering of the river; implementation of the RPO; the restoration of substantial areas of river–related vegetation communities; the improvement of the scenic interface of river, rock, meadow, and forest; and the maintenance of the diversity of river–related recreational opportunities. • The beneficial impact of this alternative would be partially offset by the long–term, minor to moderate, adverse impact to the cultural ORV resulting from the removal of historic structures, as well as the radiating impacts to the ORVs resulting from concentrations of visitors (e.g., at Taft Toe).	• A long–term, minor, beneficial impact on ORVs would result largely due to the removal of facilities that impede flood flows and inhibit the natural meandering of the river; implementation of the RPO; the restoration of substantial areas of river–related vegetation communities; the improvement of the scenic interface of river, rock, meadow, and forest; and the maintenance of the diversity of river–related recreational opportunities. • The beneficial impact of this alternative would be partially offset by the long–term, minor to moderate, adverse impact to the cultural ORV resulting from the removal of historic structures, potential disturbance of river–related archeological resources and the radiating impacts to the ORVs resulting from concentrations of visitors.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER (continued)		
Impoundment (Segment 3A) and Merced River Gorge (Segment 3B)		
	• Continued adverse impacts would be largely due to the presence of the Cascades Diversion Dam and the associated continued loss of riparian vegetation and habitat, interference with movement of aquatic wildlife (including rainbow trout), and interference with the free–flowing condition of the river.	• The actions of this alternative would have a long–term, moderate to major, beneficial impact on ORVs, largely because the removal of Cascades Diversion Dam and implementation of the RPO would substantially improve the free–flowing condition of the river, enhance riparian habitat and rainbow trout movement, and improve views of waterfalls and cliffs. This beneficial impact would be partially offset by adverse impacts to cultural ORVs resulting from the removal of the Cascades houses.
El Portal (Segment 4)		
	• There would generally be no impacts to ORVs in this segment; however, some adverse impacts would continue, largely because of the presence of facilities that contribute to the loss or disturbance of riparian vegetation and river–related habitat. This adverse impact would partially be offset by beneficial impacts to the recreation ORV associated with existing roadways that provide visitor access for river–related recreational opportunities, and the preclusion of future development incompatible with the RPO.	• In the El Portal segment, the actions of this alternative would have a long–term, minor beneficial impact, largely because implementation of the RPO would remove and limit development on the riverbank and contribute to the restoration of sensitive riparian vegetation communities (e.g., at Hennessey's Ranch). In addition, the recreation ORV would be beneficially impacted by improved hiking opportunities along the river. The beneficial impact to ORVs for this segment would be partially offset by the long–term, minor, adverse impacts to the cultural ORV due to the possible loss of historic structures and possible disturbance of archeological sites.
Wawona (Segment 7)		
	• ORVs of the Wawona segment would continue to experience long–term, adverse impacts, largely due to the presence of facilities that displace river–related vegetation and detract from views of Wawona Dome from the river. These adverse impacts would be partially offset by the continuation of the management trend to restore riparian areas and the beneficial impact to the biological and scenic ORVs that would result.	• In the Wawona segment, the actions of this alternative would have a long–term, minor, beneficial impact, largely due to the beneficial effects of implementing the RPO. The beneficial impact would be partially offset by the radiating impacts to ORVs resulting from new employee housing in Wawona.
VISITOR EXPERIENCE		
	• This alternative would continue to allow for spontaneity in a Valley visit, but most visitors would still rely on private vehicles, resulting in traffic and seasonal congestion.	• Opportunities for visitors to travel spontaneously to and through Yosemite Valley would be reduced, causing a long–term, minor, adverse impact to those visitors who expect to drive into Yosemite Valley at any time.
	• There would be both beneficial and adverse impacts, depending upon visitor expectations and desires.	• The average visitor would experience a long–term, moderate, adverse impact because of the increase in the time required to travel to the Valley.
	• Many visitors would continue to spend time searching for parking and could become frustrated by the need to search for parking in scattered locations.	• The reliability of the Yosemite Valley transportation system would cause long–term, major, beneficial impacts because visitors would be better served by the expanded and more frequent bus service.

Acronyms:

CO carbon monoxide
HABS/HAER Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record
HVR highly valued resource(s)
NO$_x$ nitrogen oxide
NPS National Park Service
ORV Outstandingly Remarkable Values
PA Programmatic Agreement
PM particulate matter
RPO River Protection Overlay
SHPO State Historic Preservation Office
VOC volatile organic compound
WSR Wild and Scenic River
YCS Yosemite Concession Services Corp.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
MERCED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER (continued)		
Impoundment (Segment 3A) and Merced River Gorge (Segment 3B)		
• Impacts to ORVs would be the same as described for Alternative 2; the actions of this alternative would be long–term, moderate to major, beneficial.	• Impacts to ORVs would be the same as described for Alternative 2; the actions of this alternative would be long–term, moderate to major, and beneficial.	• Impacts to ORVs would be the same as described for Alternative 2; the actions of this alternative would be long–term, moderate to major, and beneficial.
El Portal (Segment 4)		
• Impacts to ORVs would be the same as described for Alternative 2; the actions of this alternative would be long–term, minor, and beneficial.	• Impacts to ORVs would be the same as described for Alternative 2; the actions of this alternative would be long–term, minor, and beneficial.	• Impacts to ORVs would be the same as described for Alternative 2; the actions of this alternative would be long–term, minor, and beneficial.
Wawona (Segment 7)		
• Impacts to ORVs would be long–term, minor, and beneficial, largely due to the beneficial effects of implementing the RPO.	• Impacts to ORVs would be the same as described for Alternative 3; the actions of this alternative would have a long–term, minor, beneficial impact, largely due to the beneficial effects of implementing the RPO.	• Impacts to ORVs would be the same as described for Alternative 2; the actions of this alternative would have a long–term, minor, beneficial impact, largely due to the beneficial effects of implementing the RPO. The beneficial impact would be partially offset by the radiating impacts to ORVs resulting from new employee housing in Wawona.
VISITOR EXPERIENCE		
• The spontaneity of travel to and through Yosemite Valley would be reduced, thereby causing a long–term, major, adverse impact to those visitors who expect to drive into Yosemite Valley at any time.	• The spontaneity of travel to and through Yosemite Valley would be reduced, thereby causing a long–term, major, adverse impact to those visitors who expect to drive into Yosemite Valley at any time.	• The spontaneity of travel to and through Yosemite Valley would be reduced, thereby causing a long–term, major, adverse impact to those visitors who expect to drive into Yosemite Valley at any time.
• The average visitor would experience a long–term, negligible, adverse impact due to the increase in the time required to travel to the Valley.	• The average visitor would experience a long–term, moderate, adverse impact due to the increase in the time required to travel to the Valley.	• The average visitor would experience a long–term, minor, adverse impact due to the increase on the time required to travel to the Valley.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
VISITOR EXPERIENCE (continued)		
	• Visitation levels would continue to grow, resulting in more crowding, longer delays in getting access to the Valley, and increased demand on a relatively small number (475) of campsites and a relatively larger number (1,260) of lodging units.	• On most days visitors would find a more tranquil environment, with transit services distributing visitors to more destinations than under Alternative 1. This would potentially result in fewer visitors in the east Valley and more opportunities for visitors in the mid–Valley. • Opportunities for recreation would be oriented more toward the shuttle bus system, thus reducing spontaneity and causing both long–term, beneficial, and adverse impacts. The degree of impact would depend upon the expectations and desires of each visitor. • Opportunities for camping overnight in Yosemite Valley would increase moderately (to 500 sites), causing a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact. Opportunities for lodging would decrease substantially (to 961 units), causing a long–term, moderate, adverse impact.
TRANSPORTATION		
		• The overall impact to traffic operations would be long–term, major, and beneficial because the actions of this alternative would reduce traffic volume, and improve traffic flow within the Valley.
	• Existing traffic patterns would continue. Visitors would continue to be able to drive to the Valley and travel in their private vehicles to most destinations within the Valley.	• Average travel time to access the Valley would increase by 20 to 21 minutes (over existing travel times), representing a long–term, moderate, adverse impact to visitors.
	• Traffic volumes would be higher than any of the action alternatives, and traffic volumes would be expected to increase in the future.	• Traffic volumes on roads would be reduced by 50%, and bus trips into the Valley would increase by 285 per day. This would represent a major decrease in overall traffic volumes and a major improvement in traffic flow, resulting in a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact.
	• Traffic congestion would continue to occur at the busy intersections of Sentinel Road with Southside Drive and Northside Drive.	• Traffic congestion would be reduced at the intersections of Sentinel Road with Northside Drive and Southside Drive, and traffic flow would improve on Pohono Bridge in the morning and evening and substantially improve on El Portal Road and Northside Drive. These changes would lead to a long–term, major, beneficial impact.
	• Traffic flow would be acceptable, but congested, along Northside Drive between Yosemite Village and Yosemite Lodge.	

Acronyms:

CO	carbon monoxide
HABS/HAER	Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record
HVR	highly valued resource(s)
NO$_x$	nitrogen oxide
NPS	National Park Service
ORV	Outstandingly Remarkable Values
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PM	particulate matter
RPO	River Protection Overlay
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
VOC	volatile organic compound
WSR	Wild and Scenic River
YCS	Yosemite Concession Services Corp.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
VISITOR EXPERIENCE (continued)		
• On most days visitors would find a more tranquil environment, as described in the summary for Alternative 2.	• On most days visitors would find a more tranquil environment, as described in the summary for Alternative 2.	• On most days visitors would find a more tranquil environment, as described in the summary for Alternative 2.
• Impacts to the opportunities for recreation would be similar to Alternative 2.	• Impacts to the opportunities for recreation would be similar to Alternative 2.	• Impacts to the opportunities for recreation would be similar to Alternative 2.
• Opportunities for camping in Yosemite Valley would decrease modestly (to 449 sites), causing a long–term, minor, adverse impact, and would decrease substantially for lodging (to 982 units), causing a long–term, moderate, adverse impact.	• Opportunities for camping in Yosemite Valley would decrease moderately for camping (to 441 sites, the fewest sites of any alternative), causing a long–term, minor, adverse impact, and would decrease substantially for lodging (to 982 units, the same as Alternative 3), causing a long–term, moderate impact.	• Opportunities for camping in Yosemite Valley would increase substantially for camping (to 585 sites), causing a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact, and would decrease substantially for lodging (to 1,012 beds), resulting in a long–term, moderate, adverse impact.
TRANSPORTATION		
• The overall impact to traffic operations would be long–term, major, and beneficial because the actions of this alternative would reduce traffic volume, improve traffic flow, and decrease the overall time required to travel within the Valley.	• The overall impact to traffic operations would be long–term, major, and beneficial because the actions of this alternative would reduce traffic volume, improve traffic flow, and decrease the overall time required to travel within the Valley.	• The overall impact to traffic operations would be long–term, moderate, and beneficial because the actions of this alternative would reduce traffic volume, improve traffic flow, and decrease the overall time required to travel within the Valley. However, this alternative would have the most traffic compared to Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.
• Average travel time to access the Valley would increase by 8 minutes over Alternative 1, representing a long–term, minor, adverse impact to visitors.	• Average travel time to access the Valley would increase by 29 minutes over Alternative 1, representing a long–term, moderate, adverse impact to visitors.	• Average travel time to access the Valley would increase by 19 minutes over Alternative 1, representing a long–term, minor, adverse impact to visitors.
• Traffic volumes on roads would be reduced by 49%, and bus trips into the Valley would increase by 253 per day. This would represent a decrease in traffic volumes and a improvement in traffic flow, resulting in a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact.	• Traffic volumes on roads would be reduced by 57%, and bus trips into the Valley would increase by 254 per day. This would represent a decrease in traffic volumes and a major improvement in traffic flow, resulting in a long–term, major, beneficial impact.	• Traffic volumes on roads would be reduced by about 31%, and bus trips into the Valley would increase by 239 per day. This would represent a decrease in traffic volumes and an improvement in traffic flow, resulting in a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact.
• Traffic congestion would be reduced at the intersections of Sentinel Road with Northside Drive and Southside Drive. Traffic flow would remain relatively unchanged on Southside Drive and would improve substantially on Northside Drive. These actions would cause a long–term, major, beneficial impact.	• Traffic congestion at major intersection and roadway segments would be the same as Alternative 3, except there would be a greater improvement in the level of service on El Portal Road. Traffic flow would remain relatively unchanged on Southside Drive and would improve substantially on Northside Drive. These actions would cause a long–term, major, beneficial impact.	• Traffic congestion would be somewhat reduced at the intersections of Sentinel Road with Northside Drive, and Southside Drive and traffic flow would improve along Southside Drive during the inbound peak hour only, causing a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
NOISE		
Vehicle Noise		
	• Transportation–related noise would continue with no change from its current levels; therefore, there would be no change in impact. • Peak vehicle sound would not typically be noticeable at a distance of 100 feet or more from Yosemite Valley roads, except for individual sound events such as the passing of buses.	• Overall, general sound levels associated with traffic along most roadways in the Valley would be reduced, which represents a long–term, negligible, beneficial impact. • East of El Capitan crossover, traffic and the associated sound would be concentrated on Southside Drive and Sentinel Road. Northside Drive would experience long–term, major, beneficial impacts from the removal of the sound of all vehicles between Yosemite Lodge and El Capitan crossover and between Stoneman Bridge and Yosemite Village. • The general reduction in sound levels would be accompanied by an increase in the number of bus trips into the Valley. The areas west of El Capitan crossover, Southside Drive from El Capitan crossover to Sentinel Bridge, and the Camp 6 area would experience long–term, major, adverse impacts because of the increases in the number of sound events associated with buses. • Increases in bus–related sound events would be accompanied by long–term, major, beneficial impacts through the decrease in sound events along Northside Drive from Yosemite Lodge to El Capitan crossover and minor reductions in such events between Stoneman Bridge and Yosemite Village on Northside Drive.
Nonvehicle Noise		
	• Nontransportation–related noise would continue to affect the experiences of both visitors and residents, with no change from current levels. • Existing noise sources include maintenance activities, conversations, air conditioners, electrical generators, radios, and other similar small appliances.	• Overall, nonvehicle noises would be reduced in Yosemite Valley, which would result in a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact. • El Portal, Badger Pass, Hazel Green, and Foresta would experience an increase in nonvehicle noise levels, which would result in a long–term, moderate, adverse impact.

Acronyms:

CO	carbon monoxide
HABS/HAER	Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record
HVR	highly valued resource(s)
NO$_x$	nitrogen oxide
NPS	National Park Service
ORV	Outstandingly Remarkable Values
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PM	particulate matter
RPO	River Protection Overlay
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
VOC	volatile organic compound
WSR	Wild and Scenic River
YCS	Yosemite Concession Services Corp.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
NOISE		
Vehicle Noise		
• This alternative would maintain current sound conditions west of El Capitan crossover and substantially reduce traffic volumes east of El Capitan crossover, resulting in an overall reduction in sound levels from traffic. The reduction in overall impacts to sound levels would be long–term, minor, and beneficial. • Because this alternative would intercept all long–distance buses at Taft Toe, it would reduce the occurrence of noticeable sound events in most east Valley locations, resulting in long–term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts. • Closure of Northside Drive between Yosemite Lodge and El Capitan crossover and between Stoneman Bridge and Yosemite Village would have long–term, major, beneficial impacts related to sound reduction from the removal of all traffic.	• This alternative would result in sound level reductions throughout the portions of the Valley east of El Capitan crossover. Although this reduction would be greater than for Alternative 3, the difference between these two alternatives would not be perceptible. • The introduction of out–of–Valley shuttle buses would result in an increase in the number of very noticeable sound events west of El Capitan crossover. The impact in this area would be long–term, major, and adverse. • Similar to Alternatives 2 and 3, this alternative would result in long–term, major, beneficial impacts related to sound reduction along Northside Drive between Yosemite Lodge and El Capitan crossover and between Stoneman Bridge and Yosemite Village.	• This alternative would introduce additional long–distance bus traffic onto the Valley roadway system. Because the existing traffic patterns would be maintained with this alternative, adverse impacts from the sound of the buses would occur along all roadways to the west of Yosemite Village. • While overall sound levels are estimated to remain unchanged, resulting in long–term, negligible impacts, individual sound events would increase and have a long–term, major, adverse impact on the sound environment in most parts of the Valley. • Existing traffic patterns would be maintained; adverse impacts from the sound of buses would be heard along all roads to the west of Yosemite Village.
Nonvehicle Noise		
• Overall, nonvehicle noises would be reduced in Yosemite Valley, which would result in a long–term, minor, beneficial impact. • El Portal would experience an increase in nonvehicle noise levels due to an increase in employee beds, which would result in a long–term, minor, adverse impact.	• Overall, nonvehicle noises would be reduced in Yosemite Valley, which would result in a long–term, minor, beneficial impact. • Increases in nonvehicle noise in El Portal, South Landing, and Badger Pass would result in long–term, moderate, adverse impacts.	• Overall, nonvehicle noises would be reduced in Yosemite Valley, which would result in a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact. • Increases in nonvehicle noise in El Portal, Foresta, and Henness Ridge would result in long–term, moderate, adverse impacts.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENTS					
Local Communities					
	• The existing character of the communities of Yosemite Valley, El Portal, Wawona, and Yosemite West would remain unchanged. Commuting conditions in these communities would remain unchanged. Crowded and substandard conditions and general lack of available housing and privacy would continue to exist for employees living in Yosemite Valley.	• Improvements to the housing quality in Yosemite Valley would be a long–term, major, beneficial impact. • Although overall summer and winter residential population growth (27% and 97%, respectively) would be expected to occur gradually, the increase would cause long–term, major, adverse impacts on the El Portal social environment. • Summer and winter population growth in Wawona (18% and 44%, respectively) would cause a long–term, major, adverse impact to the Wawona social environment. • New residential populations would have a long–term, negligible, adverse impact on most utility and fire protection services in Wawona, El Portal, and Foresta areas. • New residential population in El Portal would have a long–term, moderate, adverse impact on Mariposa County regarding the need for increased law enforcement and court services. • Impacts on the Mariposa County High School system would be long–term, negligible, and adverse. Impacts to the elementary schools would be long–term, minor, and adverse until the primary headquarters are relocated. Relocation of the Concessioner Headquarters would likely have long–term, major, adverse impacts on the elementary school system by threatening the viability of the Yosemite Valley school. • Child care operations in Yosemite Valley and El Portal would experience short–term, major, adverse impacts until facilities can be expanded. • Increased Mariposa County ambulance service needs would represent a long–term, minor, adverse impact. • The placement of NPS and concessioner stables at McCauley Ranch, the replacement of 14 NPS houses, and the potential development of 700 visitor parking spaces would have a long–term, major, adverse impact in the Foresta area. • In Wawona, no impacts on the local school system or child care system would be expected; however, increased infrastructure and utility demands would present a long–term, negligible, adverse impact.	• Impacts to housing quality in Yosemite Valley would be the same as those described under Alternative 2. • Although overall summer and winter residential population growth (28% and 98%, respectively) would be expected to occur gradually, the increase would cause long–term, major, adverse impacts on the El Portal social environment. • Impacts to utilities, service and infrastructure needs (including schools), fire protection services, and court and law enforcement needs would be essentially the same as those described under Alternative 2. • The placement of NPS and concessioner stables at McCauley Ranch and the replacement of 14 NPS houses would have a long–term, minor, adverse impact in the Foresta area.	• Impacts to housing quality in Yosemite Valley would be the same as those described under Alternative 2. • Although overall summer and winter residential population growth (31% and 111%, respectively) would be expected to occur gradually, the increase would cause long–term, major, adverse impacts on the El Portal social environment. • Impacts to utilities, service and infrastructure needs (including schools), fire protection services, and court and law enforcement needs would be essentially the same as those described under Alternative 2.	• Impacts to housing quality in Yosemite Valley would be the same as those described for Alternative 2. • Although overall summer and winter residential population growth (28% and 100%, respectively) would be expected to occur gradually, the increase would cause long–term, major, adverse impacts on the El Portal social environment. • Impacts to the social environment in Foresta would be long–term, major, and adverse. • Impacts to utilities, service and infrastructure needs (including schools), fire protection services, and court and law enforcement needs would be essentially the same as those described under Alternative 2. • Impacts to Yosemite West from parking at Henness Ridge would cause long–term, minor, and adverse impacts. • The impacts on Wawona would be the same as those described under Alternative 2.
Visitor Population					
	• No changes to the park's visitor facilities or operations would occur; therefore, no impacts on visitors are expected.	• The equivalent of a 1.5% decrease to 1998 overnight visitation would be expected, representing a long–term, minor, adverse impact.	• The equivalent of an annual 2.6% increase from 1998 overnight visitation would be expected, representing a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact.	• The equivalent of an annual 1.3% increase from 1998 overnight visitation would be expected, representing a long–term, minor, beneficial impact.	• The equivalent of an annual 10.1% increase from 1998 overnight visitation would be expected, representing a long–term, major, beneficial impact.

Acronyms:

CO	carbon monoxide
HABS/HAER	Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record
HVR	highly valued resource(s)
NO$_x$	nitrogen oxide
NPS	National Park Service
ORV	Outstandingly Remarkable Values
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PM	particulate matter
RPO	River Protection Overlay
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
VOC	volatile organic compound
WSR	Wild and Scenic River
YCS	Yosemite Concession Services Corp.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENTS		
Local Communities		
	• The existing character of the communities of Yosemite Valley, El Portal, Wawona, and Yosemite West would remain unchanged. Commuting conditions in these communities would remain unchanged. Crowded and substandard conditions and general lack of available housing and privacy would continue to exist for employees living in Yosemite Valley.	• Improvements to the housing quality in Yosemite Valley would be a long–term, major, beneficial impact. • Although overall summer and winter residential population growth (27% and 97%, respectively) would be expected to occur gradually, the increase would cause long–term, major, adverse impacts on the El Portal social environment. • Summer and winter population growth in Wawona (18% and 44%, respectively) would cause a long–term, major, adverse impact to the Wawona social environment. • New residential populations would have a long–term, negligible, adverse impact on most utility and fire protection services in Wawona, El Portal, and Foresta areas. • New residential population in El Portal would have a long–term, moderate, adverse impact on Mariposa County regarding the need for increased law enforcement and court services. • Impacts on the Mariposa County High School system would be long–term, negligible, and adverse. Impacts to the elementary schools would be long–term, minor, and adverse until the primary headquarters are relocated. Relocation of the Concessioner Headquarters would likely have long–term, major, adverse impacts on the elementary school system by threatening the viability of the Yosemite Valley school. • Child care operations in Yosemite Valley and El Portal would experience short–term, major, adverse impacts until facilities can be expanded. • Increased Mariposa County ambulance service needs would represent a long–term, minor, adverse impact. • The placement of NPS and concessioner stables at McCauley Ranch, the replacement of 14 NPS houses, and the potential development of 700 visitor parking spaces would have a long–term, major, adverse impact in the Foresta area. • In Wawona, no impacts on the local school system or child care system would be expected; however, increased infrastructure and utility demands would present a long–term, negligible, adverse impact.
Visitor Population		
	• No changes to the park's visitor facilities or operations would occur; therefore, no impacts on visitors are expected.	• The equivalent of a 1.5% decrease to 1998 overnight visitation would be expected, representing a long–term, minor, adverse impact.

Acronyms:

CO	carbon monoxide
HABS/HAER	Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record
HVR	highly valued resource(s)
NO$_x$	nitrogen oxide
NPS	National Park Service
ORV	Outstandingly Remarkable Values
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PM	particulate matter
RPO	River Protection Overlay
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
VOC	volatile organic compound
WSR	Wild and Scenic River
YCS	Yosemite Concession Services Corp.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENTS		
Local Communities		
• Impacts to housing quality in Yosemite Valley would be the same as those described under Alternative 2. • Although overall summer and winter residential population growth (28% and 98%, respectively) would be expected to occur gradually, the increase would cause long–term, major, adverse impacts on the El Portal social environment. • Impacts to utilities, service and infrastructure needs (including schools), fire protection services, and court and law enforcement needs would be essentially the same as those described under Alternative 2. • The placement of NPS and concessioner stables at McCauley Ranch and the replacement of 14 NPS houses would have a long–term, minor, adverse impact in the Foresta area.	• Impacts to housing quality in Yosemite Valley would be the same as those described under Alternative 2. • Although overall summer and winter residential population growth (31% and 111%, respectively) would be expected to occur gradually, the increase would cause long–term, major, adverse impacts on the El Portal social environment. • Impacts to utilities, service and infrastructure needs (including schools), fire protection services, and court and law enforcement needs would be essentially the same as those described under Alternative 2.	• Impacts to housing quality in Yosemite Valley would be the same as those described for Alternative 2. • Although overall summer and winter residential population growth (28% and 100%, respectively) would be expected to occur gradually, the increase would cause long–term, major, adverse impacts on the El Portal social environment. • Impacts to the social environment in Foresta would be long–term, major, and adverse. • Impacts to utilities, service and infrastructure needs (including schools), fire protection services, and court and law enforcement needs would be essentially the same as those described under Alternative 2. • Impacts to Yosemite West from parking at Henness Ridge would cause long–term, minor, and adverse impacts. • The impacts on Wawona would be the same as those described under Alternative 2.
Visitor Population		
• The equivalent of an annual 2.6% increase from 1998 overnight visitation would be expected, representing a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact.	• The equivalent of an annual 1.3% increase from 1998 overnight visitation would be expected, representing a long–term, minor, beneficial impact.	• The equivalent of an annual 10.1% increase from 1998 overnight visitation would be expected, representing a long–term, major, beneficial impact.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENTS (continued)		
Regional Economies		
	• No change in Yosemite visitor spending behavior would occur under this alternative since no changes to type of goods and services available to visitors would occur. No change in park employment is projected; therefore, no employment impact on the regional economy would occur.	• The overall economic impacts of the changes from visitor spending and operational spending to the regional economy would be long–term, negligible, and beneficial. This impact would result primarily from the long–term, negligible, beneficial impact associated with the spending and employment effects from the increased park operations.
	• No new construction is proposed to occur within the Valley; therefore, there would be no construction spending impacts on the regional economy.	• During the first 5 years of development, approximately $32 million in annual spending would expand the regional economy by almost $45.5 million of output. This and other related activities would represent an overall short–term, negligible, beneficial impact. • Increased employment opportunities in the region would create a short–term, negligible, beneficial impact. • Redevelopment of lodging and campsite facilities would present long–term, negligible, adverse impacts by changing visitor spending in the region. • The overnight decrease in visitation (and its associated visitor spending) would be expected to have a long–term, negligible, adverse impact on the regional economy, assuming it represents a long–term decrease in the Valley's visitor capacity.
Concessioners and Cooperators		
	• No impacts are projected under this alternative that would affect any of the concessioner or cooperator operations or finances.	• Proposed changes to Yosemite Valley facilities would have a long–term, minor, adverse impact on the primary concessioner, mostly associated with new employee housing located outside the Valley. • Reductions in Curry Village tent cabins would have a long–term, moderate, adverse impact on Yosemite Institute because program participants would have to use other, more expensive lodging facilities. • Associated increases in employees plus additional employee housing in El Portal for Yosemite Association staff may have a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact on the organization. • The impacts to The Ansel Adams Gallery are indeterminate. • Proposed changes to visitor interpretation facilities would have a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact on the Yosemite Association by providing improved and increased retail sales opportunities. • The Yosemite Dental Clinic would experience a long–term, minor, adverse impact due to reduction of employees living in the Valley.

Acronyms:

CO	carbon monoxide
HABS/HAER	Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record
HVR	highly valued resource(s)
NO$_x$	nitrogen oxide
NPS	National Park Service
ORV	Outstandingly Remarkable Values
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PM	particulate matter
RPO	River Protection Overlay
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
VOC	volatile organic compound
WSR	Wild and Scenic River
YCS	Yosemite Concession Services Corp.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENTS (continued)		
Regional Economies		
• The overall economic impacts of the changes from visitor spending and operational spending to the regional economy would be long–term, negligible, and beneficial. This impact would result primarily from the long–term, negligible, beneficial impact associated with the spending and employment effects from the increased park operations.	• The overall economic impacts of the changes from visitor spending and operational spending to the regional economy would be long–term, negligible, and beneficial. This impact would result primarily from the long–term, negligible, beneficial impact associated with the spending and employment effects from the increased park operations.	• The overall economic impacts of the changes from visitor spending and operational spending to the regional economy would be long–term, minor, and beneficial. This impact would result primarily from the long–term, moderate, beneficial impact associated with the spending and employment effects from the increased park operations.
• During the first 5 years of develop–ment, approximately $31.0 million in annual spending would expand the regional economy by almost $44 million of output. This and other related activities would represent an overall short–term, negligible, beneficial impact. • The impact to employment opportunities would be the same as described in Alternative 2. • Impacts from redevelopment of lodging and campsite facilities would be the same as those discussed for Alternative 2.	• During the first 5 years of develop–ment, approximately $32.2 million in annual spending would expand the regional economy by almost $46 million of output. This and other related activities would represent an overall short–term, negligible, beneficial impact. • The impact to employment opportunities would be the same as described in Alternative 2. • Impacts from redevelopment of lodging and campsite facilities would be the same as those discussed for Alternative 2.	• During the first 5 years of develop– ment, over $35 million in annual spending would expand the regional economy by almost $50 million of output. This and other related activities would represent an overall short–term, negligible, beneficial impact. • The impact to employment opportunities would be the same as described in Alternative 2.
Concessioners and Cooperators		
• Impacts to the primary concessioner (currently YCS) would essentially be the same as those described under Alternative 2. • Reductions in tent cabins would have the same impact as Alternative 2.	• Impacts to the primary concessioner (currently YCS) would essentially be the same as those described under Alternative 2. • Reductions in tent cabins would have the same impact as Alternative 2.	• Impacts to the primary concessioner (currently YCS) would essentially be the same as those described under Alternative 2. • Reductions in tent cabins would have the same impact as Alternative 2.
• Impacts to the Yosemite Dental Clinic, The Ansel Adams Gallery, the Yosemite Association, the Yosemite Institute, the El Portal Chevron Station, and the El Portal Market would be the same as those described under Alternative 2.	• Impacts to the Yosemite Dental Clinic, The Ansel Adams Gallery, the Yosemite Association, the Yosemite Institute, the El Portal Chevron Station, and the El Portal Market would be the same as those described under Alternative 2.	• The impacts to The Ansel Adams Gallery, the Yosemite Dental Clinic, the Yosemite Association, the Yosemite Institute, the El Portal Chevron Station, and the El Portal Market would be the same as those discussed under Alternative 2.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENTS (continued)		
Concessioners and Cooperators (continued)		
		• Unless suitable replacement facilities could be provided, relocation of the programs administrative offices and the adaptive reuse of the East Auditorium would, respectively, represent long–term, minor and moderate, adverse impacts on the Yosemite Institute. • Proposed changes to visitor access and relocation of employee housing would have a net long–term, minor, adverse impact on the El Portal Chevron Station and a long–term, negligible, adverse impact on the El Portal Market.
PARK OPERATIONS		
	• Existing NPS parkwide operations are supported by approximately 565 personnel assigned to the Maintenance, Protection, Interpretation, Resources Management, and Concessioner Administration divisions, and the Superintendent's office. • Staff and operations costs to support this current work force were approximately $21,205,000 in 1999, or approximately $37,531 per person.	• This alternative would require that approximately 127 additional NPS personnel be assigned to the Maintenance, Protection, Interpretation, Resources Management, Concessioner, and Administration divisions. • Additional staff and operations costs to support this additional work force would be approximately $4,762,500 annually in additional park funding for salary and operations costs above those discussed for Alternative 1, representing a long–term, moderate, adverse impact.
Energy Consumption		
	• No discernible changes to current home energy consumption would occur because the housing would remain the same. • Over time, total vehicle fuel consumption would decrease relative to current levels due to the vehicle fleet turnover to vehicles with improved fuel economy. This would represent a savings of approximately 441,400 gallons per year, or a 14% reduction in vehicle energy consumption per year by 2015 from current conditions. This represents a long–term, beneficial impact to energy consumption.	• Overall propane consumption would increase by 60,000 gallons per year, or a 17% increase, representing a long–term, minor, adverse impact. • By 2015, there would be a combined motor fuel savings of 1,006,300 gallons of fuel. This is a decrease of approximately 37% from existing overall energy consumption for vehicles and represents a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact to energy consumption. (Similar energy consumption savings would be achieved by 2005 and 2010.)

Acronyms:

CO	carbon monoxide
HABS/HAER	Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record
HVR	highly valued resource(s)
NO$_x$	nitrogen oxide
NPS	National Park Service
ORV	Outstandingly Remarkable Values
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PM	particulate matter
RPO	River Protection Overlay
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
VOC	volatile organic compound
WSR	Wild and Scenic River
YCS	Yosemite Concession Services Corp.

Table B
Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENTS (continued)		
Concessioners and Cooperators (continued)		
PARK OPERATIONS		
• This alternative would require that approximately 115 additional NPS personnel be assigned to the Maintenance, Protection, Interpretation, Resources Management, Concessioner, and Administration divisions. • The staff and operations costs to support this additional work force would be approximately $4,312,500 annually in additional park funding for salary and operations costs above those discussed for Alternative 1, representing a long–term, moderate, adverse impact.	• This alternative would require that approximately 130 additional NPS personnel be assigned to the Maintenance, Protection, Interpretation, Resources Management, Concessioner, and Administration divisions. • The staff and operations costs to support this additional work force would be approximately $4,875,000 annually in additional park funding for salary and operations costs above those discussed for Alternative 1, representing a long–term, moderate, adverse impact.	• This alternative would require that approximately 131 additional NPS personnel be assigned to the Maintenance, Protection, Interpretation, Resources Management, Concessioner, and Administration divisions. • The staff and operations costs to support this additional work force would be approximately $4,912,000 annually in additional park funding for salary and operations costs above those discussed for Alternative 1, representing a long–term, moderate, adverse impact.
Energy Consumption		
• Overall propane consumption would increase by 34,520 gallons per year, or a 10% increase, representing a long–term, minor, adverse impact. • The overall net effect of Alternative 3 by 2015 would be a combined motor fuel savings of 528,800 gallons of fuel. This would be an approximately 20% decrease from Alternative 1 in overall energy consumption for vehicles, and represents a long–term, minor, beneficial impact to energy consumption. There would be a similar percentage decrease in energy consumption savings achieved by 2005 and 2010. • The combined motor fuel consumption savings for this alternative in 2005, 2010, and 2015 would represent a minor, long–term, beneficial impact.	• Overall propane consumption would increase by 60,020 gallons per year, or a 17% increase, representing a long–term, minor, adverse impact. • The overall net effect of Alternative 4 by 2015 would be a combined motor fuel savings of 1,150,500 gallons of fuel. This would be an approximately 42% decrease from Alternative 1 in overall energy consumption for vehicles, and represents a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact to energy consumption. There would be a similar percentage decrease in energy consumption savings achieved by 2005 and 2010. • The combined motor fuel consumption savings for this alternative in 2005, 2010, and 2015 would represent a moderate, long–term, beneficial impact.	• Overall propane consumption would increase by 79,110 gallons per year, or a 23% increase, representing a long–term, moderate, adverse impact. • The overall net effect of Alternative 5 by 2015 would be a combined motor fuel savings of 822,600 gallons of fuel. This would be an approximately 30% decrease from Alternative 1 in overall energy consumption for vehicles, and represents a moderate, long–term, beneficial impact to energy consumption. There would be a similar percentage decrease in energy consumption saving achieved by 2005 and 2010. • The combined motor fuel consumption savings for this alternative in 2005, 2010, and 2015 would represent a long–term, moderate, beneficial impact.